

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Appellee,

v.

RICHARD MENDOZA JR.,
Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CR 2018-0133
Filed November 15, 2018

THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.
NOT FOR PUBLICATION
See Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. 111(c)(1); Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.19(e).

Appeal from the Superior Court in Pima County
No. CR20124401001
The Honorable Jane L. Eikleberry, Judge

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Joel Feinman, Pima County Public Defender
By Michael J. Miller, Assistant Public Defender, Tucson
Counsel for Appellant

STATE v. MENDOZA
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Judge Eppich authored the decision of the Court, in which Presiding Judge Vásquez and Chief Judge Eckerstrom concurred.

E P P I C H, Judge:

¶1 Following a jury trial, appellant Richard Mendoza Jr. was convicted of two counts of first-degree burglary and six counts of prohibited possession. The trial court sentenced him to concurrent and consecutive prison terms totaling 29.75 years. This court affirmed his convictions in 2016, but vacated his sentences, concluding some terms were improperly ordered to be served consecutively. *State v. Mendoza*, No. 2 CA-CR 2015-0115 (Ariz. App. Apr. 7, 2016) (mem. decision). The trial court resentenced Mendoza, ordering a different combination of concurrent and consecutive sentences that again totaled 29.75 years' imprisonment.

¶2 On appeal from resentencing, counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530 (App. 1999), stating he has reviewed the record and "has been unable to find any arguably meritorious issue to raise on appeal." Counsel has asked us to search the record for fundamental error. Mendoza has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶3 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for fundamental, reversible error in regard to Mendoza's sentences and have found none. See A.R.S. §§ 13-703(J), 13-708, 13-1508, 13-3102(A)(4), (M). Therefore, the sentences are affirmed.